



#12/80  
3-120

PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE:

APPLICANT: JAN G. TÖNNIES

GROUP ART UNIT: 3763

U.S. S.N.: 09/787,342

EXAMINER: K. THOMPSON

U.S. FILING DATE:

ATTY. DOC. 1567.2

INT. FILING DATE: SEPTEMBER 20, 1999

INT. S.N.: PCT/DE99/03000

EARLIEST PRIORITY DATE: SEPTEMBER 18, 1998

FOR: INFUSION PUMP COMPRISING A COMPUTER  
FOR CALCULATING THE RESPECTIVE  
MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE DOSAGE

RECEIVED  
MAR 18 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Box Non-Fee Amendment  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Sir:

In response to the office action dated October 8, 2002, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the objection to the Drawings and Specification and the rejection of Claims 6-12, based upon the enclosed Amendments to the Drawings, Amendments to the Specification, Amendments to the Claims and the Remarks.

Applicant wishes to note that this subject response is being submitted in accordance with the *Suggested Revised Format for Making Amendments*. Accordingly, these Introductory

LARSON & LARSON,  
ATTORNEYS  
AT  
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.  
LARGO, FL 33773-5504  
PH. 727-546-0660  
FAX 727-545-1595

Comments, the Amendments to the Drawings, the Amendments to the Specification, Amendments to the Claims and the Remarks all begin on separate sheets. Changes to the Drawings are being made in accordance with the helpful suggestions of the Examiner. In particular, Figure 2 has been added to show the structural elements set forth in the Claims. More particularly, Figure 2 illustrates the infusion pump, the blocking device, the memory, the comparator, the external control device, the first computer and the second computer. Of course, corresponding description has been inserted within the Specification through the Amendments to the Specification section. However, since all of these elements have been set forth in the Claims, no new subject matter has been added to either the Drawings or Specification.

Applicant wishes to note that although the Examiner suggested that the quantitative figure should be shown, it has been purposefully excluded from Figure 2, since the quantitative figure is not an actual structural element so much as a determination made by the memory of the first computer as a result of the medicament being delivered to the patient's body. It is therefore not necessary to illustrate the quantitative figure in the Drawings. Adequate description regarding the quantitative figure is however provided in the Specification. Further, the computer is the first computer

LARSON & LARSON,  
ATTORNEYS  
AT  
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.  
LARGO, FL 33773-5504  
PH. 727-546-0660  
FAX 727-545-1595

which has been designated by the numeral 12 in Figure 2 and the Specification.

Applicant further wishes to note that this response is being timely filed since a Two-Month Extension of Time has been filed with the appropriate fee.

Finally, Applicant respectfully asks that the Examiner see that the Attorney Docket Number be changed to the one set forth above in the stylization of this case from 1497.4 to 1567.2.

LARSON & LARSON,  
ATTORNEYS  
AT  
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.  
LARGO, FL 33773-5504  
PH. 727-546-0660  
FAX 727-545-1595